

## REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Office Action of July 10, 2008. This Amendment is in full response thereto. Thus, Applicants respectfully request continued examination and allowance of the application.

Claims 44 - 71 are pending of which 44 - 71 stand rejected.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 44 - 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steynberg et al. '699 in view of Butwell et al. '750. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 44 -71 are not anticipated by Steynberg et al '699 in view of Butwell et al. '750.

In the previous Official Action, dated January 2, 2008, the Examiner notes that:

“Steynberg is silent with respect to recovery rate of hydrogen, carbon monoxide, and carbon dioxide, by passing the waste gas through a first bed comprising alumina, a second bed comprising silica gel, and a third bed comprising at least one member selected from the group consisting of zeolite, carbon molecular sieves, and titanium silicate.”

The Examiner then notes that:

“Butwell teaches a process to achieve separation of various gaseous components from waste gas stream including separating nitrogen, methane, and gaseous hydrocarbons, utilizing 2 separate PSA stages

adsorbents such as zeolites (4A pore size), carbon, silica gel, alumina titanium silicate, and molecular sieves.”

Butwell '750 deals exclusively with the separation of nitrogen from methane, as contained in natural gas streams. The entire disclosure focuses on the problems of the difficulties involved in this separation. Butwell '750 neither teaches nor suggests the separation of, or any kind of recovery rates for methane and carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, or hydrocarbons (with at least 2 carbon atoms) from a single gas stream which combines all these components.

Additionally, Butwell '750 fails to even mention anything pertaining to:

“a first bed comprising alumina, a second bed comprising silica gel, and a third bed comprising at least one member selected from the group consisting of zeolite, carbon molecular sieves, and titanium silicate”, for which the deficiency regarding recovery rates, as pointed out explicitly by the Examiner, depends.

Hence, the invention of claim 44 of the instant application is neither taught nor suggested by either Steynberg et al. '699 or Butwell et al. '750, either alone or in combination. This rejection is thus improper and should be withdrawn. As claims 45 – 69 are dependent upon claim 44, these rejections are also improper and should be withdrawn.

## **Conclusion**

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he/she is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

It is not believed that any fee is due at this time. If that belief is incorrect, please debit deposit account number 01-1375. Also, the Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment to deposit account number 01-1375.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elwood Haynes/  
Elwood L. Haynes, Reg. No. 55,254

Date: **November 6, 2008**

Air Liquide  
2700 Post oak Blvd., Suite 1800  
Houston, Texas 77056  
Phone: (713) 624-8954  
Fax: (713) 624-8950